

Languages of lossless seeds

Karel Břinda

Laboratoire d'Informatique Gaspard Monge
Université Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée
Paris, France

karel.brinda@univ-mlv.fr

March 26, 2014

Abstract

Several algorithms for similarity search employ seeding techniques to quickly discard very dissimilar regions. In this paper, we study theoretical properties of lossless seeds, i.e., spaced seeds having full sensitivity. We prove that lossless seeds coincide with languages of certain sofic subshifts, hence they can be recognized by finite automata. Moreover, we show that these subshifts are fully given by the number of allowed errors k and the seed margin ℓ .

1 Introduction

The annual volume of data produced by the Next-Generation Sequencing technologies has been rapidly increasing; even faster than growth of disk storage capacities. Thus, new efficient algorithms and data-structures for processing, compressing and storing these data, are needed.

Similarity search represents the most frequent operation in bioinformatics. In huge DNA databases, a two-phase scheme is the most widely used approach to find all occurrences of a given string up to some Hamming or Levenshtein distance. First of all, most of dissimilar regions are discarded in a fast *filtration phase*. Then, in a *verification phase*, only “hot candidates” on similarity are processed by classical time-consuming algorithms like Smith-Waterman [19] or Needleman-Wunsch [15].

Algorithms for the filtration phase are often based on so-called *seed filters* which make use of the fact that two strings of the same length m being in Hamming distance k must necessarily share some exact patterns. We can represent these patterns as strings over the alphabet $\{\#, -\}$ called *seeds*, where the “matching” symbol $\#$ corresponds to a matching position and the “joker” symbol $-$ to a matching or a mismatching position.

For example, for two strings of length 15, matching within two errors (so-called $(15, 2)$ -problem), the shared patterns are $\#\#- \#--\#\#- \#$ or $#####$. For illustration, if we consider that two strings match as $===X=====X=====$ (where the symbols $=$ and X represent respectively matching and a mismatching positions), then the corresponding seed positions can be following:

```
===X=====X=====
.##-#--##-#....
....#####.....
```

As the second seed is the longest possible contiguous seed in this case, we easily observe the advantage of spaced seeds in comparison to contiguous seeds; for the same task, we can find spaced seeds with higher number of $\#$'s (so-called *weight*).

Two basic characteristics of seeds are *selectivity* and *sensitivity*. Selectivity measures restrictivity of the filter created from the seed. In general, higher weight implies better selectivity of the filter. *Lossless* seeds are those seeds having full sensitivity. They are easier to handle mathematically on one hand, but attain lower weight on the other hand. Therefore, *lossy* seeds are more suitable for practical purposes since a small decrease in sensitivity can be compensated by considerable improvement of selectivity.

1.1 Literature

The idea of lossless seeds was originally introduced by Burkhardt and Karkkainen [1]. Let us remark that lossy spaced seed appeared in the same time in the PatterHunter program [14]. Possible generalization of lossless seeds was studied by Kucherov et al. [9]. The authors studied seed families and the case when more hits of a given seed are required (the pattern is shared at more positions). They proved that for a fixed number k of errors, *optimal seeds* (i.e., seeds with highest possible weight among all seeds solving the problem) must asymptotically satisfy $m - w(m) \in \Theta(m^{\frac{k}{k+1}})$, where $w(m)$ denotes the maximal possible weight of a seeding solving the (m, k) -problem. They also started a systematic study of seeds created by repeating of short patterns. Afterwards, the results on asymptotic properties of optimal seeds were generalized by Farach-Colton et al. [8]. Computational complexity of optimal seed construction was derived by Nicolas and Rivals [16].

Further, the theory on lossless seed was significantly developed by Egidi and Manzini. First, they studied seeds designed from mathematical objects called perfect rulers [5]. The idea of utilization of some type of “rulers” was later independently extended by KB [3] (cyclic rulers) and Edigi and Manzini [7] (difference sets). In [7], these ideas were extended also to seed families. Let us mention that cyclic rulers and difference sets mathematically correspond to each other. Edigi and Manzini [6] also showed possible usage of number-theoretical results on quadratic residues for seed design.

In practice, seeds often find their use in short-read mapping in mappers based on the seed-and-extend paradigm (for more details on read mapping, see for example [10]). ZOOM [11] and PerM [4] are examples of such mappers, which utilize lossless seeds.

A list of papers on spaced seed is regularly maintained by Noé [17].

1.2 Our object of study

One of the most important theoretical aspects of lossless seeds are their structural properties. Whereas good lossy seeds usually show irregularity, one can observe that good lossless seeds are often repetitions of short patterns ([9, 4, 3, 7]). The question whether optimal seeds can be constructed in all cases by repeating patterns (being short with respect to seed length) remains open (see [3, Conjecture 1]). Its answering could have practical impacts on bioinformatical software tools development since the search space of programs for lossless seeds design could be significantly cut and also indexes in programs using lossless seeds for approximate string matching could be more memory efficient ([4]).

1.3 Results

In this paper, we follow and further develop ideas from [3]. First we transform the problem of seed detection into another criterion (Theorem 1). Then we prove that the sets of seeds obtained after fixing the parameters:

- the number of allowed errors k ;
- the seed margin ℓ , which is the difference between the size m of compared strings and the seed length s ;

coincide with languages of some sofic subshifts. Therefore, those sets of seeds are recognized by finite automata. We also show how these sofic subshifts can be decomposed into subshifts of finite type. These results provide a new view on lossless seeds and explain their periodic properties.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Combinatorics on words

An *alphabet* $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, \dots, a_{m-1}\}$ is a finite set of symbols called *letters*. A finite sequence of letters from $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *finite word* (over $\mathcal{A}$). The set $\mathcal{A}^*$ of all finite words (including the empty word ε) provided with the operation of concatenation is a free monoid. The concatenation is denoted

multiplicatively. If $w = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_{n-1}$ is a finite word over $\mathcal{A}$, we denote its length by $|w| = n$ and use the symbol $|w|_a$ for the number of occurrences of the letter $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in w . We deal also with bi-infinite sequences of letters from $\mathcal{A}$ called *bi-infinite words* $\mathbf{w} = \cdots \mathbf{w}_{-2} \mathbf{w}_{-1} | \mathbf{w}_0 \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \cdots$ over $\mathcal{A}$. The sets of all bi-infinite words over $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

A finite word w is called a *factor* of a word $\mathbf{u}$ ($\mathbf{u}$ being finite or bi-infinite) if there exist words p and s (finite or one-side infinite) such that $\mathbf{u} = pws$. We say that the word w is a prefix of $\mathbf{u}$ if $p = \varepsilon$, and a suffix of $\mathbf{u}$ if $s = \varepsilon$. For given indexes i and j , the symbol $\mathbf{u}[i, j]$ denotes the factor $\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_{i+1} \cdots \mathbf{u}_j$ if $i \leq j$, or ε if $i > j$. A concatenation of k words w is denoted by w^k . The set of all *factors* of a word $\mathbf{u}$ ($\mathbf{u}$ being finite or bi-infinite) is called the language of $\mathbf{u}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u})$. Its subset $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \mathcal{A}^n$ containing all factors of $\mathbf{u}$ of length n is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{u})$.

Let us remark that this notation will be used extensively in the whole text. For instance $\mathbf{w}[2, 5]^{-4}$ denotes the word created by concatenation of the factor $\mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3 \mathbf{w}_4 \mathbf{w}_5$ of a bi-infinite word $\mathbf{w}$ and the word $----$. Similarly, for a finite word v of length n , by $\cdots --|v|-----$ we denote the bi-infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ such that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ ($\mathbf{u}_i = v_i$) and for all $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ ($\mathbf{u}_i = -$). For more information about combinatorics on words, we can refer to Lothaire I [13].

2.2 Symbolic dynamics

Consider an alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. We define a *shift* operation σ as $[\sigma(\mathbf{u})]_i = \mathbf{u}_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. The map σ is invertible, and for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the power σ^k is defined by composition. The map σ is continuous on $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, therefore, $(\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ is a dynamical system, which is called a *full shift*.

A bi-infinite word $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ *avoids* a set of finite words X if $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}) \cap X = \emptyset$. By S_X we denote the set of all bi-infinite words that avoid X and we call it a *subshift*. If X is a regular language, S_X is called *sofic subshift*; if X is finite, S_X is called a *subshift of finite type*. The language $\mathcal{L}(S)$ of a subshift S is the union of languages of all bi-infinite words from S . By $\mathcal{L}_n(S)$ we denote the set $\mathcal{L}(S) \cap \mathcal{A}^n$.

It holds that a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a subshift if and only if it is invariant under the shift map σ (that means $\sigma(S) = S$) and it is closed with respect to the Cantor metric on $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, which is defined as

$$d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}, \\ 2^{-s} & \text{if } \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}, \text{ where } s := \min \{|i| \mid \mathbf{u}_i \neq \mathbf{v}_i\}. \end{cases}$$

A *labeled graph* over an alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ is a structure $H = (V, E, s, t, h)$, where V is a finite set of vertices, E is a finite set of edges, $s : E \rightarrow V$ is a surjective source map, $t : E \rightarrow V$ is a target map, and $\text{lab} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a labeling function. A word $\mathbf{w}$ ($\mathbf{w}$ being finite or bi-infinite) is a path in H if $t(\mathbf{w}_i) = s(\mathbf{w}_{i+1})$ for all indexes i . A label $\text{lab}(\mathbf{w})$ of the path $\mathbf{w}$ is defined by $(\text{lab}(\mathbf{w}))_i = \text{lab}(\mathbf{w}_i)$ for all indexes i . For a given graph H , we denote by Σ_H the set of all bi-infinite paths in H .

It holds that a subshift S is sofic if and only if there exists a labeled graph H such that $S = \Sigma_H$. Moreover, S is of finite type if and only if there exists such strongly connected graph. General theory of subshifts is very well summarized in [12].

3 Lossless seeds

The binary alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{\#, -\}$ is called *seed alphabet* and from now on, we will consider only this alphabet. Every finite word over this alphabet is a *seed*. The *weight* of a seed Q is the number of occurrences of the letter $\#$ in Q .

Definition 1. Let m and k be positive integers. Every set $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ is called *error combination of k errors*. A seed Q such that $|Q| < m$ detects an error combination $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ at position $t \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ if for all $j \in \{0, \dots, |Q|-1\}$ it holds $(Q_j = \# \implies j + t \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\})$.

The implication expresses the fact that there cannot be any mismatch at positions of the “matching” symbol $\#$. Bi-infinite or finite words over the seed alphabet can be compared using the following relation.

Definition 2. On the sets $\mathcal{A}^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we define the relation $\preceq$ as:

$$u \preceq v \iff (u_i = \# \implies v_i = \#) \text{ holds for all possible indexes } i.$$

The relation $\preceq$ is reflexive, transitive, and weakly anti-symmetric, hence it is a partial order. Then we define a seed analogy of the logical function **OR** applied on bi-infinite words and producing, again, a bi-infinite word.

Definition 3. Consider k bi-infinite words $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}$ over $\mathcal{A}$. We define a k -nary operation $\oplus$ as:

$$(\oplus(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}))_i = \begin{cases} \# & \text{if } (\mathbf{u}^{(j)})_i = \# \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ - & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Using the operations σ and $\oplus$, we can easily decide if a specific error combination is detected by a seed at a given position, or not. The following theorem will be crucial for seed analysis in the rest of the text.

Theorem 1. Let m and k be positive integers and Q be a seed such that $|Q| < m$. Denote $\mathbf{w} := \dots -|^{-\ell}Q--\dots$. Then Q detects an error combination $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ at a position $t \in \{0, \dots, m-|Q|\}$ if and only if

$$(\oplus(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{w})))_{\ell-t} = -. \quad (1)$$

Proof. Q detects $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ at position t if

$$\forall j \in \{0, \dots, |Q|-1\} : Q_j = \# \implies j+t \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}.$$

This is equivalent to $\forall p \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} (\mathbf{w}_{p-t+\ell} = -)$, which is equivalent to (1). $\square$

Corollary 1 (of Theorem 1). A seed Q does not detect an error combination $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ at any position t if and only if

$$(\oplus(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{w})))_{[0, \ell]} = \#^{\ell+1}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \dots -|^{-\ell}Q--\dots$ and $\ell = m - |Q|$.

Now we can distinguish more ways of usage seeds. The basic case is the so-called *single seed and single hit* problem when the given seed is required to detect every combination of k errors at least at one position. Nevertheless, we can also utilize *families* of seeds such that every error combination of k errors must be detected by some seed from the given family. In both cases, we could also require *multiple hits*, which means that every combination of k errors would have to be detected by given seed or members of seed families at least at h distinct positions for some fixed h .

In the rest of this text, we study only the case of one seed and one hit, however, the results hold for the other cases. It will be presented in the extended version of this paper. In all cases, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 are the basic tools for studying seeds as languages of some subshifts.

4 Single seed and single hit problem

First let us introduce a rigorous definition of the basis case (single seed and single hit).

Definition 4. A seed Q solves the (m, k) -problem if every error combination of k errors is detected by Q at some position $t \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$.

A verification if a given seed Q solves an (m, k) -problem, can be done directly using Corollary 1. Now we define sets of seeds for which we will later show that they coincide with languages of some subshifts.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#	
0	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
1	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
2	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
3	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
4	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
5	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
6	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
7	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
8	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
9	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
10	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
11	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
12	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
13	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
14	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
15	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
16	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
17	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
18	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#
	-	-	-	-	-	#	#	-	#	-	-	-	-	-	-	#	-	#	#

Figure 1: The Laser method for the $(19,2)$ -problem and the seed $Q = \#\#-\#-----\#-\#\#$ in Example 2.

Definition 5. For given ℓ and k , the set of all seeds such that each seed Q solves the $(|Q| + \ell, k)$ -problem is denoted by Seed_k^ℓ .

Example 1. $\text{Seed}_2^3 = \{\varepsilon, \#, -, \#-, -\#, --, \#--, -\#-, --\#, ---, \#---, \#---, -\#---, ---\#, ----, \dots\}$.

As a simple consequence of Corollary 1, we get a full characterization of all seeds solving $(m, 1)$ -problems ([3, Theorem 5]).

Proposition 1. $\text{Seed}_1^\ell = \{Q \in \mathcal{A}^* \mid \#^{\ell+1} \text{ is not a factor of } Q\}$

Proof. Denote $\mathbf{v} = \dots -- |^\ell Q -- \dots$ and $\ell = m - |Q|$. Then from Corollary 1 follows that:

Q solves the $(m, 1)$ -problem $\iff \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} ((\sigma^i(\mathbf{v}))[0, \ell] \neq \#^{\ell+1}) \iff Q$ does not contain $\#^{\ell+1}$. $\square$

Nevertheless, describing sets Seed_k^ℓ for $k > 1$ is a more complicated task as we will see below. Let us mention that in the case of two errors, Corollary 1 corresponds to the Laser method [3, Section 4.1], [2] as we illustrate in the following example.

Example 2. Consider a seed $Q = \#\#-\#-----\#-\#\#$ of length 14 and the $(19, 2)$ -problem. In Figure 1 we show a corresponding schematic table. Denote $\mathbf{w} := \dots -- |^{-5} Q -- \dots$. The words $\oplus(\sigma_i(\mathbf{w}), \sigma_j(\mathbf{w}))$ occur diagonally. It is easily seen from Corollary 1 that Q does not detect the error combination $\{5, 13\}$ since $\ell = 5$ and $(\oplus(\sigma^5(\mathbf{w}), \sigma^{13}(\mathbf{w}))) [0, 5] = \#^6$.

4.1 Functions sh_k and (ℓ, k) -valid bi-infinite words

Inspired by Corollary 1, we define functions sh_k which check the criterion given by (2) globally on bi-infinite words.

Definition 6. Consider a positive integer k . We define a function $sh_k : (\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}})^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\}$ as:

$$sh_k(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}) = \sup_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{p \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ p \mid \mathbf{v}[0, p-1] = \#^p, \text{ where } \mathbf{v} = \oplus \left(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \right) \right\}. \quad (3)$$

We extend the range of the function $sh_k(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ to $(\mathcal{A}^*)^k$. Finite words w are transformed into bi-infinite words $\mathbf{v}$ as $\mathbf{v} := \dots --|w----$.

Informally said, $sh_k(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)})$ is equal to

- a finite $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ if after arbitrary “aligning” of the words followed by the logical OR operation (in the Laser method the diagonal bi-infinite words), each run of $\#$ ’s has length at most s and the value s is attained for some “alignment”;
- $+\infty$ if there exists an “alignment” with run of infinitely many $\#$ ’s (e.g., $sh_2(\dots vv|vv \dots, \dots ww|ww \dots)$ with $v = \#\#-$ and $w = \#--$).

It is readily seen that every function sh_k is symmetric and shift invariant with respect to all variables. The next observations show how to make lower and upper estimates on its value.

Observation 1 (Lower estimate). Let $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}$ be bi-infinite words. If $\oplus(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{u}^{(k)}))$ has a factor $\#^p$ for some $i_1, \dots, i_k$; then $sh_k(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \geq p$.

Observation 2 (Upper estimate). Let $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}, \mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(k)}$ be bi-infinite words such that $\mathbf{u}^{(1)} \preceq \mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)} \preceq \mathbf{v}^{(k)}$, where $\preceq$ is the relation from Definition 2. Then $sh_k(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}) \leq sh_k(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(k)})$.

Bi-infinite words for which the sh_k function is bounded by some ℓ , will be the “bricks” our subshifts. Their factors Q are exactly seeds solving $(|Q| + \ell, k)$ -problems.

Definition 7. A bi-infinite word $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $sh_k(\mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}) \leq \ell$ is called $(\ell; k)$ -valid bi-infinite word. By V_k^ℓ we denote the set of all $(\ell; k)$ -valid words.

Lemma 1. A seed Q solves an $(|Q| + \ell, k)$ -problem if and only if it is a factor of an (ℓ, k) -valid bi-infinite word.

Proof. $\implies$: The word $\mathbf{w} := \dots --|^{-\ell} Q -- \dots \in V_k^\ell$ is an (ℓ, k) -valid word. must be (ℓ, k) -valid since otherwise Q would not solve the $(|Q| + \ell, k)$ -problem by Corollary 1.

$\impliedby$: For a contradiction assume that there exists a factor Q of a bi-infinite word $\mathbf{u}$, which does not solve the $(|Q| + \ell, k)$ -problem. Let the non-detected error combination be $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. Denote $\mathbf{w} = \dots --|^{-\ell} Q -- \dots$.

We use shift invariance of sh_k and Observation 2 to get

$$sh_k(\mathbf{w}, \dots, \mathbf{w}) \leq sh_k(\mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}) \leq \ell. \quad (4)$$

Since Q does not detect the error combination $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, it follows from Corollary 1 that

$$(\oplus(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{w}))[0, \ell] = \#^{\ell+1}.$$

Nevertheless, this gives us a lower estimate on $sh_k(\mathbf{w}, \dots, \mathbf{w})$ – it must be bigger than or equal to $\ell + 1$ which is contradicting (4). □

4.2 Subshifts of (ℓ, k) -valid words

The property of (ℓ, k) -validity is preserved under the shift operation. Moreover, the sets V_k^ℓ are subshifts. To prove it, we need to find a criterion for verifying (ℓ, k) -validity based on comparing finite factors of a given bi-infinite word.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a bi-infinite word over the seed alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. $\mathbf{u}$ is $(\ell; k)$ -valid;
2. each k -tuple $(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)})$ of factors of $\mathbf{u}$ of length $\ell + 1$ satisfies

$$\text{sh}_k(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \leq \ell;$$

3. each k -tuple $(w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(k)})$ of factors of $\mathbf{u}$ of length $\ell + 1$ satisfies

$$\oplus(w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(k)}) \neq \#^{\ell+1}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. We prove three implications.

1 $\implies$ 2: Consider any factors $v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}$. Find their positions $i_1, \dots, i_k$ in $\mathbf{u}$. Since

$$\dots -- | v^{(1)} -- \dots \preceq \sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{u}), \quad \dots, \quad \dots -- | v^{(k)} -- \dots \preceq \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{u}),$$

we obtain from the assumption, shift invariance of sh_k , and Observation 2 that it holds

$$\text{sh}_k(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \leq \text{sh}_k(\mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}) \leq \ell$$

which is what we wanted to prove.

2 $\implies$ 3: It is an easy consequence of the definition of the sh_k function.

3 $\implies$ 1: For a contradiction assume that $\mathbf{u}$ is not (ℓ, k) -valid; i.e., there exist integers $i_1, \dots, i_k$ such that $\oplus(\sigma^{i_1}(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \sigma^{i_k}(\mathbf{u}))[0, \ell] = \#^{\ell+1}$. Therefore, the equation (5) does not hold for the factors $w^{(1)} := \mathbf{u}[i_1, i_1 + \ell], \dots, w^{(k)} := \mathbf{u}[i_k, i_k + \ell]$. $\square$

In Example 2, such words $w^{(1)}$ and $w^{(2)}$ of length $\ell + 1$ are $\#\#-\#--$ and $--\#-\#\#$. Similarly, $v^{(1)}$ and $v^{(2)}$ can be again $\#\#-\#--$ and $--\#-\#\#$, but also for example $-\#\#-\#$ and $\#-\#\#--$.

The main consequence of Lemma 2 is the fact that every seed must be constructed from reciprocally compatible tiles of length $\ell + 1$. To describe this property, we define a relation of compatibility on the set $\mathcal{A}^{\ell+1}$.

Definition 8. *For given ℓ and k , we define the k -nary compatibility relation C_k^ℓ on $\mathcal{A}^{\ell+1}$ as*

$$C_k^\ell(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \iff \text{sh}_k(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \leq \ell.$$


Corollary 2. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a bi-infinite word over the seed alphabet $\mathcal{A}$. The word $\mathbf{u}$ is (ℓ, k) -valid if and only if $\forall v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)} \in \mathcal{L}_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{u}) \left(C_k^\ell(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \right)$.*

Now let us prove that (ℓ, k) -valid words really form subshifts. We only need to show that (ℓ, k) -valid words are exactly those created from compatible “tiles”.


Lemma 3. *Every set V_k^ℓ is a subshift.*

Proof. Take $X := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{A}^* \mid \exists \{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\ell+1}(x) \left(\neg C_k^\ell(v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(k)}) \right) \right\}$. The set X contains all finite words containing some incompatible factors. Then it follows from Corollary 2 that $S_X = V_k^\ell$. $\square$

Example 3. *Even though the seeds $Q^{(1)} = \#\#-\#--$ and $Q^{(2)} = --\#-\#\#$ solve the $(11, 2)$ -problem, the seed $Q = Q^{(1)}--Q^{(2)}$ does not solve the $(19, 2)$ -problem, as we have seen in Example 2. The reason is that, by Lemma 2, $Q^{(1)}$ and $Q^{(2)}$ are not compatible. Therefore, any seed $\tilde{Q}$ of the form $\tilde{Q} = Q^{(1)} \rightarrow^p Q^{(2)}$ for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$, cannot solve the $(|\tilde{Q}| + 5, 2)$ -problem.*



(a) A graph created as a de-Bruijn graph from the set of vertices G .



(b) The previous graph after minimization.

Figure 3: Labeled graphs for the subshift $S(G)$ given by the unique $(3, 2)$ -generating set $G = \{\#--\#, \#---, -\#--, --\#-, ---\#, ----\}$. Both graphs H must satisfy $\Sigma_H = S(G)$. Every such graph H determines a deterministic recognizing automaton for the set $\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_H)$.

Remark 1. For $k = 2$ and arbitrary positive ℓ , we can derive all generating sets. Let $V = \{w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(q)}\}$ denote the set of all seeds of length $\ell+1$ solving the $(2\ell+1, k)$ -problem. Consider a graph R given by the adjacency matrix

$$(M_R)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } C_2^\ell(w^{(i)}, w^{(j)}), \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the generating sets are maximal independent sets (maximal with respect to inclusion) in the graph R . Similar derivation can be made for cases with $k > 2$ using hypergraphs.

Example 5. Let $k = 2$. For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, all seeds solving $(\ell+1, 2)$ -problems are mutually compatible, which means that there exists a unique $(\ell, 2)$ -generating set. We list them out in the following table.

ℓ	G
1	$\{--\}$
2	$\{\#-- , -\#- , --\# , ---\}$
3	$\{\#--\# , \#--- , -\#-- , --\#- , ---\# , ----\}$
4	$\{\#\#-- , -\#\#- , --\#\# , ---\#\# , \#-\#- , -\#-\# , --\#-\# , \#--\#- , -\#--\# , \#---\# ,$ $\#---- , -\#--- , --\#--- , ---\#- , ----\# , -----\}$

Example 6. Let $k = 2$ and $\ell = 5$. By Remark 1, we find the graph R . We can partially simplify this graph. We can say that two vertices v and w in this graph are equivalent if $\forall x \in V(C_k^\ell(x, v) \iff C_k^\ell(x, w))$. Then we can put equivalent vertices into one vertex and we obtain




Figure 4: Graph of sets of equal seeds for searching $(5, 2)$ -generating sets in Example 6.

the graph in Figure 4, where

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0 = \{ & \text{-----}; \text{-----}\#, \text{----}\#\text{--}, \text{---}\#\text{---}, \text{--}\#\text{----}, \text{-}\#\text{-----}, \text{\#-----}; \\
& \text{----}\#\#, \text{---}\#\#, \text{--}\#\#\text{--}, \text{-}\#\#\text{---}, \text{\#\#-----}; \\
& \text{---}\#\text{--}\#, \text{--}\#\text{--}\#, \text{-}\#\text{--}\#, \text{\#--}\#\text{---}; \\
& \text{--}\#\text{--}\#, \text{-}\#\text{--}\#, \text{\#--}\#\text{--}; \text{-}\#\text{----}\#, \text{\#----}\#\text{--}; \\
& \text{\#----}\#\#, \text{\#\#----}\#, \text{\#----}\#\text{--} \}, \\
P_1 = \{ & \#\text{--}\#\text{--}\# \}, \quad P_2 = \{ \text{--}\#\#\text{--}\#, \text{-}\#\#\text{--}\#, \text{\#\#--}\#\text{--} \}, \\
P_3 = \{ & \text{--}\#\#\text{--}\#, \text{\#\#--}\#\text{--} \}, \quad P_4 = \{ \text{-}\#\text{--}\#\#, \text{\#--}\#\#\text{--} \}, \\
P_5 = \{ & \text{--}\#\text{--}\#\#, \text{-}\#\text{--}\#\#, \text{\#--}\#\#\text{--} \}, \quad P_6 = \{ \#\text{--}\#\text{--}\# \}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can observe that P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 can be obtained by mirroring from P_6 , P_5 , and P_4 , respectively. By finding maximal independent sets in the graph in Figure 4, we get all $(5, 2)$ -generating sets:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1 &= P_0 \cup P_1 \cup P_3 \cup P_5, & G_2 &= P_0 \cup P_1 \cup P_3 \cup P_6, \\
G_3 &= P_0 \cup P_2 \cup P_4 \cup P_6, & G_4 &= P_0 \cup P_1 \cup P_4 \cup P_6.
\end{aligned}$$

5 Conclusion

We have found a new criterion for errors detection by seeds (Theorem 1). From this criterion we have proven that lossless seeds coincide with languages of certain sofic subshifts, therefore, they are recognized by finite automata (Theorem 2). We have shown that these subshifts are fully given by the number of allowed errors k and the seed margin ℓ and that they can be further decomposed into subshifts of finite type.

These facts explain why periodically repeated patterns often appear in lossless seeds. This is caused by the fact that these patterns correspond to cycles in the recognizing automata (which correspond to cyclic seeds from [9]). Nevertheless, it remains unclear what is the upper bound on the length of cycles to obtain optimal seeds. For problems with two errors, it was conjectured in [3, Conjecture 1] that to obtain some of optimal seeds, it is sufficient to consider only patterns having length at most $\ell + 1$.

Acknowledgements. The author is supported by the ABS4NGS grant of the French government (program *Investissement d'Avenir*). He is grateful to Gregory Kucherov and Karel Klouda for helpful ideas.

References

- [1] Stefan Burkhardt & Juha Karkkäinen (2003): *Better Filtering with Gapped q -Grams*. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 56(1-2), pp. 51–70.
- [2] Karel Brinda (2013): *Laser method on-line*. Available at <http://brinda.cz/laser-method/>.

- [3] Karel Brinda (2013): *Lossless seeds for approximate string matching*. Master's thesis, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic. Available at <http://brinda.cz/publications/diplomka.pdf>.
- [4] Yangho Chen, Tade Souaiaia & Ting Chen (2009): *PerM: efficient mapping of short sequencing reads with periodic full sensitive spaced seeds*. *Bioinformatics* (Oxford, England) 25(19), pp. 2514–21, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp486.
- [5] Lavinia Egidi & Giovanni Manzini (2011): *Spaced Seeds Design Using Perfect Rulers*. In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval (SPIRE), Pisa (Italy), Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7024*, Springer, pp. 32–43, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-24583-1_5.
- [6] Lavinia Egidi & Giovanni Manzini (2013): *Better spaced seeds using Quadratic Residues*. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 79(7), pp. 1144–1155, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2013.03.002.
- [7] Lavinia Egidi & Giovanni Manzini (2014): *Design and analysis of periodic multiple seeds*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 522, pp. 62–76, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2013.12.007.
- [8] Martin Farach-Colton, Gad M. Landau, S. Cenk Sahinalp & Dekel Tsur (2007): *Optimal spaced seeds for faster approximate string matching*. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 73(7), pp. 1035–1044, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2007.03.007.
- [9] Gregory Kucherov, Laurent Noé & Mikhail Roytberg (2005): *Multiseed lossless filtration*. *IEEE/ACM transactions on computational biology and bioinformatics / IEEE, ACM* 2(1), pp. 51–61, doi:10.1109/TCBB.2005.12.
- [10] Heng Li & Nils Homer (2010): *A survey of sequence alignment algorithms for next-generation sequencing*. *Briefings in bioinformatics* 11(5), pp. 473–83, doi:10.1093/bib/bbq015.
- [11] Hao Lin, Zefeng Zhang, Michael Q Zhang, Bin Ma & Ming Li (2008): *ZOOM! Zillions of oligos mapped*. *Bioinformatics* (Oxford, England) 24(21), pp. 2431–7, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btn416.
- [12] Douglas Lind & Brian Marcus (1995): *An Introduction to Symbolic Dynamics and Coding*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626302.
- [13] M. Lothaire, editor (1997): *Combinatorics on Words*, 2. edition. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511566097.
- [14] Bin Ma, John Tromp & Ming Li (2002): *PatternHunter: faster and more sensitive homology search*. *Bioinformatics* 18(3), pp. 440–445, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/18.3.440.
- [15] Saul B Needleman & Christian D Wunsch (1970): *A general method applicable to the search for similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins*. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 48(3), pp. 443–453, doi:10.1016/0022-2836(70)90057-4.
- [16] François Nicolas & Eric Rivals (2008): *Hardness of optimal spaced seed design*. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 74(5), pp. 831–849, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2007.10.001.
- [17] Laurent Noé (2014): *Spaced seeds bibliography*. Available at http://www.lifl.fr/~noe/spaced_seeds.html.
- [18] Laurent Noé & Gregory Kucherov (2005): *YASS: enhancing the sensitivity of DNA similarity search*. *Nucleic acids research* 33(Web Server issue), pp. W540–3, doi:10.1093/nar/gki478.
- [19] Temple F. Smith & Michael S. Waterman (1981): *Identification of common molecular subsequences*. *Journal of molecular biology* 147(1), pp. 195–7, doi:10.1016/0022-2836(81)90087-5.